1 2 3 4 5 6 7	BRUCE A. HARLAND, Bar No. 230477 MONICA GUIZAR, Bar No. 202480 WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation 800 Wilshire Blvd. Ste. 1320 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone (213) 380-2344 Fax (213) 443-5098 Attorneys for Charging Party SEIU, United Healthcare Workers – West	
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
9	NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	
10	REGION 31	
11) Case No. 31-CA-066945
12	ENCINO HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER-PRIME,) Case No. 31-CA-000943
13	Respondent,))
14	and) SEIU, UNITED HEALTHCARE) WORKERS – WEST'S BRIEF IN
15	SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,) SUPPORT OF EXCEPTIONS TO) THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
16	UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS – WEST,) JUDGE'S SUPPLEMENTAL) DECISION
17	Charging Party.))
18		\
19) }
20		S
21	e to	
22	z:	
23		
. 24		
25	*	
26		
27		
28 weinberg, roger &		
ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation 1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001	UHW's Exceptions to ALJ's Supplemental Decision Case No 31-CA-066945	

EINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD

ROSENFELD
essional Corporation
during Village Parkway

The Charging Party, SEIU, United Healthcare Workers – West (the "Union" or "UHW"), hereby submits the following in support of its exceptions to the Supplemental Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, Gerald A. Wacknov.

I. RESPONDENT TERMINATED PAT AGUIRRE BECAUSE OF HER UNION ACTIVITY.

Several witnesses testified to Pat Aguirre's Union activities. For example, Pat Aguirre testified to her Union support, specifically, Pat testified that during her 13 years of employment she participated on three bargaining teams, was a chief shop steward, and also worked for the Union in March 2001, for a short time after she was fired from October through February of 2012, and again for a couple of weeks in April of 2012. Pat handled grievances and met with management on various workplace issues. The most current contract negotiations that Pat was participating in were the first negotiations for a collective bargaining agreement with Prime since it purchased and began operating the Hospital. Pat was also featured in several Union flyers. Similarly, Richard Ruppert, Union Representative, testified that "Pat was the Union" at the Encino Hospital. Kenton Smart, per diem employee and Union steward, testified that Pat was the only steward for a long time until Kenton became a steward in or about 2010. Kenton also testified that he had only handled one grievance in the entire time that he was a steward. Finally, Maggie Macias, Union Representative also testified about Pat's substantial Union involvement. Yet, the ALJ completely disregarded all of this evidence in error.

Most significantly, Pat testified at a hearing protesting the sale of Victor Valley Community Hospital to Prime. Aguirre testified at the hearing about the changes in working conditions at Encino Hospital since Prime purchased and began operating the Hospital. Present at that hearing were Lex Reddy, Prime CEO; Susan Richards, Prime CNO, and the Ancillary person in charge of Radiology at Encino and Sherman Oaks.

It should be no coincidence that at the next collective bargaining session between the Union and the Hospital, Bob Bills, Encino Hospital CEO, said that it was the Union's fault that Prime lost the ability to purchase Victor Valley Community Hospital. Both Richard Ruppert and Pat Aguirre

testified to Bob Bills making this statement at the bargaining session on September 22, 2011. Respondent obviously knew of Aguirre's active participation in the Union, so it is also no coincidence, that less than one month later, on October 13, 2011, the Hospital terminated Aguirre. These facts satisfy four of the elements set forth in *Wright Line*: (1) the employee's protected activity; (2) Respondent's knowledge of that activity; (3) adverse action taken by the Respondent against the employee; and (4) the timing of the adverse action.

The remaining elements are Respondent's animus against the Union and Respondent's motivation in discharging the two employees. It is undisputed that "Prime Healthcare Foundation (Prime) owns and operates Respondent." (ALJ Dec. at 2.) It is also undisputed that Prime had animus toward the Union. Indeed, Respondent distributed flyers against the Union, entitled, "The SEIU is DESTROYING Your Jobs." The flyer states:

Since its purchase Prime Healthcare has invested millions of dollars in much needed capital equipment at Encino Hospital. But, instead of working with hospital management, the SEIU has reacted by doing everything possible to destroy the Hospital. It looks like they want to ensure that Encino closes.

How do you gain anything if the SEIU is successful in destroying the company that you work for? SEIU leaders are fond of talking about how you are the union. If that's true, then its time to say ENOUGH! Tell the SEIU leadership to start focusing on bargaining and stop using lies that threaten to put Encino out of business.

Clearly, the statements by Bob Bills at the bargaining session in September and the flyer show the Respondent's animus towards the Union. The ALJ, however, discredits the testimony of Richard Ruppert about Bills statement at the bargaining session and fails to cite to Pat Aguirre's testimony about Bills mentioning the Victory Valley sale during bargaining.

Furthermore, Respondent's motivation for terminating Pat Aguirre is shown by its lack of

16

18 19

17

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

EINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD essional Corporation Marina Village Parkway

uniform application of imposition of discipline, failure to follow its own practice and its attempt to create unfounded reasons and justifications for the discharge. For instance, Richard Ruppert testified that he met with the former Human Resources representative, Gail Brow, who explained to Ruppert that progressive discipline and how it was imposed was based on each type of misconduct. Additionally, the very action that Pat engaged in - where Back claims Pat "lied" and therefore merited termination - was in her capacity as Union steward. In the course of Pat's representation of Arse involing Arse's termination, Pat reached an agreement with Gail Brow, the former Human Resources representative, that the Hospital would not challenge Arse's ability to collect unemployment benefits. The actions Pat took in attempting to confirm whether or not the Hospital was going to keep to its end of the bargain, i.e. by not challenging Arse's unemployment benefits, were actions done in her capacity as a Union steward. Yes, admittedly, Pat attended the unemployment hearing with Arse both as a friend and steward, but Pat's attendance at the unemployment hearing is a red herring and irrelevant to the determination of whether Pat was illegally fired for her Union activity. Instead, it was Pat's alleged conversations with Soto and Armenia that Pat "lied about" that Respondent used as a pretext to fire Pat.

Indeed, the General Counsel introduced several examples of discipline imposed by the Hospital that showed a practice by the Hospital as to imposition of progressive discipline based on the same type of conduct. (GC Exh.'s 26, 27, 28, 29 & 30.) Furthermore, Respondent's own witness, Thomas Callahan testified that discipline and whether to move to the next level depends on the circumstances. Callahan testified that serious situations, such as dangerous situations. would call for more serious discipline. Respondent's own lack of uniformity in the imposition of discipline illustrates that Respondent's stated reason for the discharges was a pretext. See McBurney Corp., 351 NLRB 799, 800 (2007) (employer "fatally undermined by the fact that ... it used the priority hiring system selectively and systematically to avoid the hiring of union applicants"); Zurn/N.E.P.C.O, 345 NLRB 12, 16-17 (2005) (employer deviated from long-standing policy in discriminating against union applicants), review denied, 154 Lab. Cas. P 10,881 (6th Cir. 2007); Toll Mfg. Co., 341 NLRB 832, 833 (2004) (employer failed to follow its own progressive

discipline system); *Embassy Vacation Resorts*, 340 NLRB 846, 848-49 (2003) (animus shown by employer's failure to give employees a chance to defend themselves and its deviation from its past practice of discipline), pet. for review dismissed, 2004 WL 210675 (D.C.Cir. Jan 28, 2004); *Guardian Automotive Trim, Inc.*, 340 NLRB 475, 475 fn.1(2003) (employer failed to follow its progressive discipline policy), affd. 177 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2447 (6th Cir. 2005). Yet, the ALJ completed disregarded Callahan's testimony, discredited Ruppert's testimony concerning progressive discipline, and instead found Back credible concerning the Hospital's application of progressive discipline. The ALJ should conclude that Respondent discharged Pat Aguirre in violation of Section 8(a)(3) of the Act.

II. THE CREDIBLITY OF RICHARD RUPPERT, PAT AGUIRRE AND BACK.

The ALJ discredits the testimony of Union Representative, Richard Ruppert, when that testimony supports the Charging Party's case, yet, inexplicably credits Rupperts testimony to support an arbitrary finding that Back did not act with pretext when she terminated Pat Aguirre. On the other hand, the ALJ overwhelmingly credited Back's testimony. Here, it is hard to believe that Back is going to admit to firing Pat Aguirre for Union activity as she was one of the decision makers and could be found to have violated Section 8(a)(3). Clearly, Back, too, has an incentive to lie in order to avoid liability, yet the ALJ blindly credited all of Back's testimony. In fact, Pat's alleged dishonesty involved an insignificant matter that did not make much of a difference in her ability to perform her job. More importantly, Pat's alleged dishonesty was done in the course of Pat's actions as a Union steward – following up on an agreement with management involving the termination of Arse. The ALJ, therefore, erred in finding that Pat Aguirre was not engaged in protected concerted activity when she was acting as a union steward representing Arse. The ALJ should not have credited Back and discredited Ruppert and Aguirre.

///

///

///

EINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
Professional Corporation
Old Marina Village Parkway

dn, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001 - 5 -

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above and the exceptions filed by Charging Party, the Charging Party seeks appropriate remedies as reflected in the Exceptions, including the return of Ms. Aguirre to work with backpay and interest, and a reading by company officials to the employees.

Dated: June 18, 2013

EINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD essional Corporation farina Village Parkway Suite 200 eda, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001

WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation

By:

Attorneys for Charging Party SEIU, United Healthcare Workers – West

125335/681411

-6-

PROOF OF SERVICE (CCP §1013)

2

1

3

4

5

6

7 below:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

VEINBERG, ROGER &

ofessional Corporation I Marina Village Parkway Suite 200 sda, CA 94501-1091 510.337,1001

I am a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of California. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, in the office of a member of the bar of this Court, at whose direction the service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action.

On August June 18, 2013, I served the following documents in the manner described

SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS-WEST'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF EXCEPTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S SUPPLEMENTAL **DECISION**

✓ [X] (BY U.S. MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Parcel Service, and I caused such envelope(s) with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California.

On the following part(ies) in this action:

Original to: Lester A. Heltzer

Executive Secretary

National Labor Relations Board 1099 14th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20570

Copies to:

Gerald A. Wacknov Administrative Law Judge National Labor Relations Board

Division of Judges 901 Market Street, Suite 300

San Francisco, California 94103-1779

Jonathan A. Siegel Jackson Lewis LLP 5000 Birch Street, Suite 5000 Newport Beach, CA 92660

Simone Pang, Attorney

National Labor Relations Board, Region 31 11150 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 700

Los Angeles, CA 90064-1824

Juan Carlos Ochoa Diaz

Field Attorney

National Labor Relations Board, Regional 11150 West Olympic Blvd., Suite 700

Los Angeles, CA 90064-1825

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on June 18, 2013, at Los Angeles, California.

Melanie Garion

- 7 -

UHW's Exceptions to ALJ's Supplemental Decision Case No 31-CA-066945